



## Land Use & Natural Resources Committee

Item #14-9-5  
Information

August 26, 2014

### Six-County Regional Active Transportation Program Funding Recommendations

**Issue:** How should SACOG invest Regional Active Transportation Program funds?

**Recommendation:** For information only. The Transportation Committee will take action on this item.

**Discussion:** Pursuant to the passage of Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101, the Active Transportation Program (ATP) was created and is being administered by Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The ATP combines many federal and state funding streams previously used for bicycle, pedestrian, safety, and other related purposes into one funding stream with broad eligibilities. Approximately \$368 million has been budgeted for ATP projects across the state over the next three years, beginning with fiscal year (FY) 2014.

#### *ATP Background*

ATP funding is divided into three components and is distributed as follows:

- 50 percent to the state for a statewide competitive program;
- 10 percent to small urban and rural regions with populations of 200,000 or less for the small urban and rural area competitive program; and
- 40 percent to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000 for the large urbanized area competitive program.

Per statewide ATP guidelines, the goals of the ATP are to:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking;
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users;
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 (C728, §2008) and SB 391 (C585, §2009);
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity, through the use of programs including but not limited to projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding;
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program; and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

#### *State ATP*

Fifty percent of the funding available over the next three years (\$184 million) is in the process of being competitively awarded for projects selected by the CTC on a statewide basis; in the SACOG region, 45 applications were submitted for \$48 million of funds. The CTC approved the list of projects for Statewide ATP funds on August 20, 2014. Seven applications from the SACOG region were awarded a total \$6.5 million (Attachment F). Projects that were not successful in the State ATP were eligible to compete in the Regional ATP funding program described below.

### *Regional ATP*

As the MPO, SACOG is responsible for the selection and recommendation of up to \$9.8 million in ATP projects within the six-county region. This Regional ATP funding program was implemented collaboratively between SACOG, El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC), and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA). Staff engaged Board committees on the development of the Regional ATP guidelines from January through March 2014 with approval by the SACOG Board on April 20, 2014. The six-county call for projects was issued May 22 following the CTC's approval of the Regional ATP Guidelines (Attachment E). Applicants had until July 29, 2014, to submit applications and supplemental application information, which was requested from statewide ATP applicants who elected to compete in the regional program.

After the projects recommended for Statewide ATP funding were removed from the applicant pool, the Regional ATP received 45 project nominations (32 from the Statewide ATP and 13 new projects) from 23 project sponsors requesting a total of \$48 million for competitive funding. Ten projects totaling \$9,863,700 are recommended for Regional ATP funding. Recommendations are shown in Attachment A, with the evaluation process described below.

### *Project Evaluation*

All project applications were screened for compliance with the eligibility criteria identified in the Regional ATP Guidelines by SACOG, EDCTC and PCTPA staff; all projects submitted were deemed eligible to compete for funding. Projects were then evaluated by an 11-member multidisciplinary Regional ATP Working Group (Attachment D) comprised of volunteers from around the region with expertise in bicycle and pedestrian transportation, engineering, public health, Safe Routes to School, transit, air quality, community groups, and land use planning. The Working Group evaluated projects in accordance with the project scoring criteria from the adopted Regional ATP Guidelines, excerpted below:

- Increase walking and bicycling through targeted strategies: increasing access to transit services, increasing access to schools, eliminating gaps or removing barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network, and completing facilities (0-30 points)
- Reduce the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries (0-25 points)
- Improve public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues (0-10 points)
- Demonstrates cost effectiveness, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and operating expenditures while offering strong performance benefits (0-10 points)
- Provides benefit to a disadvantaged community and includes project features that provide benefit for members of this community (0-10 points)
- Project advances active transportation efforts to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through reducing or shortening vehicle trips today and over time, as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391 (0-10 points)
- Other considerations: project demonstrates readiness to deliver within the ATP schedule, performance on past grants and/or Federal Aid Projects, and strong support by stakeholders in the community in which the project is located (0-10)

### *Regional ATP Funding Recommendation*

The Working Group was charged with developing a funding recommendation to SACOG staff. The resulting recommendation includes a variety of active transportation projects totaling \$9.8 million. In compliance with the Statewide ATP Guidelines, \$2.45 million (one quarter of the regional share) must be spent on projects that benefit a disadvantaged community as defined by the Statewide ATP guidelines. The project recommendations include \$6 million in projects (supporting at least five jurisdictions) that benefit disadvantaged communities, which exceeds the minimum requirement. MPOs must demonstrate to CTC that the regional funding benefits a broad spectrum of projects to benefit active transportation users, and staff is confident the recommended project list meets this requirement.

A contingent project list was also developed by the Working Group in the event of delivery failure by any of the recommended projects. Projects awarded ATP funding must be ready to allocate funds within FY 2014-15 or FY 2015-16, and complete construction within the next three fiscal years. ATP projects will be closely monitored to ensure timely delivery within the identified constraints of the program. In the event that a project is unable to allocate the awarded funds within the timeframe identified by the CTC or obtain an extension, a project on the contingency list would receive ATP funds in its place. In this instance, the project that failed to meet its delivery timeline would forfeit their ATP funds and would have to compete again to receive funds from the ATP or any other funding source. Inclusion on the contingent list is not a guarantee of funding, and projects on the list would need to re-compete in ATP Cycle 2 (anticipated in spring of 2015) or other funding rounds to receive funds. Projects would be removed if they are awarded funds through the state or regional ATP Cycle 2 call for projects, or from another funding source. The contingent list would expire after the approval of ATP Cycle 2 projects, when there will be a larger pool of ATP-funded projects to minimize the impact of project delivery failure.

Staff recommends adoption of the Working Group recommendations (Attachment A). For further detail, recommended projects and final scoring are described in Attachment B. The full evaluation process is described in Attachment C, including detail on the successive steps taken to reduce the 45 applications to the recommended list of 10 projects. Project sponsors will have the opportunity to discuss previously submitted and new proposed projects with SACOG staff to build strong applications for subsequent ATP funding rounds, and technical assistance will continue to be offered.

#### *Programming Schedule*

The Transportation Committee recommendation will go to the SACOG Board for approval at its September 18 meeting. Following Board approval, staff will provide the CTC with approved funding recommendations by the September 30 deadline. The CTC is scheduled to adopt projects using regional ATP funds at its meeting on November 12. Projects in the SACOG region will then need to be amended into the MTIP. Projects must be prepared to allocate ATP funds through the CTC process within two years and spend the funding within three years following allocation.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RDO:LSH:VSC:gg

Attachments: A—List of funding recommendations for \$9.8 million in competitive funding  
B—Regional ATP Project Award Recommendations Final Scoring and Notes  
C—Working Group evaluation process  
D—ATP Working Group Roster  
E—Approved Regional ATP Guidelines  
F—State ATP Awards Project List

Key Staff: Kacey Lizon, Planning Manager, (916) 340-6265  
Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235  
Reneé DeVere-Okie, Team Manager of Programming & Project Delivery, (916) 340-6219  
Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Team Manager of Active Transportation, (916) 340-6212  
Victoria S. Cacciatore, Project Coordinator of Active Transportation, (916) 340-6214  
Amy Martin, Transportation Planner, (916) 319-5182

**Regional ATP Recommended Funding List (in ranking order)**

In total, 10 projects are recommended for \$9.8 million in Regional ATP funding. Projects are recommended for funding at the full amount requested. This project list and contingent list were approved unanimously by the Regional ATP Working Group.

County	Applicant	Project Title	ATP Funding Recommended	Total Project Cost
SUT	City of Yuba City	Franklin Road Improvements	\$312,500	\$393,000
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Citywide Bike Lane Gap Closures	\$524,600	\$592,600
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Mather Rails to Trails Project	\$2,234,500	\$2,524,021
SAC	City of Galt	South Galt Safe Routes to Schools	\$1,800,000	\$2,150,000
SAC	Sacramento County	El Camino Avenue Phase 2 - Street and Sidewalk Improvements	\$1,691,800	\$1,922,800
SAC	City of Folsom	Oak Parkway Trail Undercrossing and Johnny Cash Trail Connection Project	\$992,000	\$1,121,000
YUB	Yuba County	Ella Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project	\$1,195,000	\$1,350,000
ELD	El Dorado County Transportation Commission	Western Slope Bicycle Travel Opportunities Map	\$50,000	\$56,478
PLA	City of Auburn	Nevada Street Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities	\$799,000	\$1,648,000
PLA	City of Colfax	North Main Street Bike Route Project	\$264,300	\$298,544
<b>Total Recommended</b>			<b>\$9,863,700</b>	

**Regional ATP Contingency List (in priority order)**

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Total Cost
YOL	City of West Sacramento	West Capitol Avenue Cycle Track	\$571,000	\$645,000
SUT	City of Live Oak	Recreational Trail Phase 2	\$791,500	\$894,000
YOL	City of Davis	Safe Routes to School Improvement Project	\$741,700	\$876,588

## **Regional ATP Project Award Recommendations Final Scoring and Notes**

The following provides a more detailed summary of the projects recommended for Regional ATP funding, those on the recommended contingency list, and projects that were removed from consideration in the final scoring round. For a complete discussion of the evaluation process, see Attachment C.

## ATP Funding Recommendation List

City of Yuba City

**\$312,500 Recommendation**

Franklin Road Improvements

\$393,000 Total Cost

The project would add a crosswalk, Class II bicycle lanes, and fill in sidewalk gaps on Franklin Road between Walton Avenue and Harding Road. The purpose of the project is to increase the safety of active transportation users across and on Franklin Road by adding crossing treatments and extending the east/west bicycle network.

Project Scoring Criteria		Avg. Reviewer Score
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	21
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	18
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	7
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	9
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	7
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	10
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	8
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>70</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>80</b>

**City of West Sacramento**  
 Citywide Bike Lane Gap Closures

**\$524,600 Recommendation**  
 \$592,600 Total Cost

The project would construct approximately 10.3 miles of new bike lanes citywide by filling in bicycle lane gaps on West Capitol Avenue, Enterprise Boulevard, Linden Road/Redwood Avenue, Jefferson Boulevard, Lighthouse Drive, Reed Avenue, Gateway Drive, Lake Washington Drive, and 15th Street. The purpose of the project is to create a stronger bicycle network by bringing the total percentage of major roads with bicycle facilities up to 92% in the City of West Sacramento.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	23
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	17
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	7
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	8
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	7
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	9
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	8
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>70</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>79</b>

**City of Rancho Cordova**  
Mather Rails to Trails Project

**\$2,234,500 Recommendation**  
2,524,021 Total Cost

The project would construct a Class I multi-use trail alongside a Union Pacific Spur between the Sacramento Regional Transit Mather/Mills Light Rail Station and the Mather Field Airport. The purpose of the project is to enhance mobility in a transit priority area for a wide variety of potential and existing users—including those traveling to and from the light rail station, the Sacramento Veteran’s Administration Hospital, nearby business parks, and residential areas—while eliminating a barrier to active transportation by providing a dedicated bicycle and pedestrian facility crossing U.S. Route 50.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	22
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	20
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	6
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	8
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	5
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	9
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	6
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>67</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>76</b>



**City of Galt**  
 South Galt Safe Routes to School

**\$1,800,000 Recommendation**  
 \$2,150,000 Total Cost

This project would construct bicycle and pedestrian improvements on seven streets adjacent to, or near, Greer Elementary, Valley Oaks Elementary, and Galt High School, including flashing beacons, Class II bicycle lanes, new crosswalks, and pedestrian bulb-outs and islands. The purpose of the project is to increase the safety for active transportation users, and to fill gaps in the active transportation network to enable safer, continuous travel on foot or by bike.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	22
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	17
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	5
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	6
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	8
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	8
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>65</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>73</b>

**Sacramento County****\$1,691,800 Recommendation**

El Camino Avenue Phase 2: Street and Sidewalk Improvements

\$1,922,800 Total Cost

The project would construct Class II bicycle lanes and sidewalks, and modify traffic signals to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle transportation on El Camino Avenue from Watt Avenue to Vera Way. The purpose of the project is to create a safer active transportation route where there are currently incomplete facilities, and to complete a 1.5 mile complete street corridor on El Camino Avenue from Watt Avenue to Mission Way.

Project Scoring Criteria		Avg. Reviewer Score
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	17
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	20
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	6
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	6
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	6
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	9
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	8
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>63</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>72</b>

**City of Folsom**  
 Oak Parkway Trail Undercrossing &  
 Johnny Cash Trail Connection Project

**\$992,000 Recommendation**  
 \$1,121,000 Total Cost

The project would construct a grade separated crossing of Natoma St, connecting Oak Parkway Trail with the Johnny Cash and Historic Powerhouse Trails. The purpose of the project is to overcome the barrier of a higher-speed road by creating a connection between existing multi-use trails in residential neighborhoods and other trail segments currently under development adjacent to schools, employment centers, and transit stations, and to further expand the off-road active transportation network in the City of Folsom.

Project Scoring Criteria		Avg. Reviewer Score
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	20
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	16
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	6
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	7
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	5
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	2
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>61</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>63</b>

**Yuba County**

Ella Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project

**\$1,195,000 Recommendation**

\$1,350,000 Total Cost

The project would add bicycle lanes, curbs and curb ramps, gutters, sidewalks, storm drains, and a raised median island on Seventh Avenue from Olivehurst Avenue to Powerline Road. The purpose of the project is to increase active transportation mobility and safety by improving Seventh Avenue around and leading to Ella Elementary and addressing community-identified safety concerns.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	18
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	15
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	5
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	7
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	8
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	10
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	5
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>58</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>68</b>

**El Dorado County Transportation Commission**  
 Western Slope Bicycle Travel Opportunities Map

**\$50,000 Recommendation**  
 \$56,478 Total Cost

The project would develop, print, and make available online a comprehensive bicycle travel opportunities map for the western slope of El Dorado County, juxtaposing the existing cycling infrastructure with destinations such as transit stations and schools while also identifying safety tips for cyclists. The purpose of the project is to encourage increased and safer biking among residents and visitors by closing an information gap about existing infrastructure and destinations reachable by bicycle.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	20
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	13
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	5
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	7
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	5
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	4
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	8
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>58</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>62</b>

**City of Auburn**  
Nevada Street Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities

**\$799,000 Recommendation**  
\$1,648,000 Total Cost

The project would add bicycle lanes and sidewalk on Nevada Street from Placer Street to Fulweiler Avenue. The purpose of the project is to increase safety by adding dedicated facilities for active transportation users and to increase access to and from the City’s multimodal station, Old Town Auburn, five public schools, and residential neighborhoods.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	17
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	15
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	5
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	8
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	4
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	7
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>56</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>63</b>

**City of Colfax**  
 North Main Street Bike Route Project

**\$264,300 Recommendation**  
 \$298,544 Total Cost

The project would create a continuous bike route on North Main Street between West Grass Valley Street and Highway 174 through restriping, route repair, widening to accommodate bike lanes when feasible, and adding bike-friendly grates, bike parking, and other features to enhance the environment for active transportation. The purpose of the project is to create a safer bicycle route throughout the City of Colfax and to the Depot Transit Center.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	16
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	14
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	5
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	8
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	3
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	3
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>53</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>56</b>

## ATP Recommended Contingency List

---

These projects are identified for funding in the event any project in the above recommended list is unable to meet the required delivery schedule. The below projects will remain available to program for Cycle 1 Regional ATP funding until the CTC adoption of Regional ATP Cycle 2. Inclusion on the contingent list does not guarantee funding in ATP Cycle 1 or in future funding rounds. Project sponsors are encouraged to apply to ATP Cycle 2 and other funding sources to fund these projects.

**City of West Sacramento**  
West Capitol Ave Cycle Track

**\$571,000 Request**  
\$645,000 Total Cost

The project would construct a raised cycle track on West Capitol Avenue between 5th Street and Garden Street, and reconfigure the intersections of West Capitol Avenue at 5th Street and at Garden Street, including removing a signalized intersection, to improve public safety and to support these changes to the public right-of-way, and add pedestrian improvements. The purpose of the project is to increase active transportation mobility adjacent to a transit priority area by prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian movement through facility design.

Project Scoring Criteria		Avg. Reviewer Score
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	16
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	12
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	6
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	7
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	7
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	7
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>55</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>62</b>



**City of Live Oak**  
Recreational Trail Phase 2

**\$791,500 Request**  
\$894,000 Total Cost

The project would construct phase 2 of the Live Oak Community Trail from the terminus of Phase 1 on Elm Street to the southern terminus of phase 3 at Pennington Road and O Street. The purpose of the project is to increase active transportation mobility and develop a public space that facilitates creative patterns of activities.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	17
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	14
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	5
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	6
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	6
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	9
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>55</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>64</b>

**City of Davis**  
 Safe Routes to School Improvement Project

**\$741,700 Request**  
 \$876,588 Total Cost

The project would construct pedestrian refuges, curb extensions, and curb ramps; relocate crosswalks; restripe traffic lanes and crosswalks; and add high visibility treatments around four elementary schools—Birch, Cesar Chavez, North Davis, and Pioneer. The purpose of the project is to address documented safety concerns and improve active transportation access to the targeted schools.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	18
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	15
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	4
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	7
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	5
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	1
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>56</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>57</b>

## **Consideration Projects Not Recommended for ATP Cycle 1 Funding**

---

The following projects were included for consideration but not ultimately recommended for funding in this Regional ATP funding round.

**City of West Sacramento**  
Sycamore Phase 2

**\$838,407 Request**  
\$947,031 Total Cost

The project would complete the preliminary engineering and right-of-way phases for a bicycle and pedestrian overpass over US 50 connecting the future Tony Lopes Park to Westmore Oaks Elementary School. The purpose of the project is to eliminate the barrier of crossing US 50 for a broad range of potential users with varying comfort levels.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	17
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	15
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	4
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	6
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	7
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	7
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	6
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>55</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>62</b>

**City of Elk Grove**  
 Laguna Creek Trail & Bruceville Road SRTS Improvements

**\$2,021,000 Request**  
 \$2,283,000 Total Cost

The project would construct multiple trail extensions and gap closures of the Laguna Creek Trail south of Sheldon Road from Lewis Stein Road to west of Bruceville Road, and fill in sidewalk gaps along Bruceville Road between Sheldon Road and Laguna Boulevard. The purpose of the project is to fill in gaps in the City’s multi-use trail system and to increase access to schools at Laguna Boulevard and Bruceville Road.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	18
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	13
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	5
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	8
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	5
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	7
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>56</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>63</b>

**Sacramento County**

Fair Oaks Boulevard Improvements Stanley Avenue to North Avenue

**\$2,100,000 Request**

\$2,373,000 Total Cost

The project would construct sidewalks and ADA upgrades, a landscaped median, Class II bike lanes; modify the traffic signal at Stanley Avenue and North Avenue; and improve existing bus stops by adding bus shelters and pullouts on Fair Oaks Blvd. from Stanley Avenue to North Avenue. The purpose of the project is to construct the final segment of several previously funded and interconnected roadway projects within the “Main Street District” of the Fair Oaks Boulevard corridor in downtown Carmichael, from Marconi Avenue to Engle Avenue.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (up to 30 points)	16
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (up to 25 points)	11
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (up to 10 points)	6
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (up to 10 points)	7
E	Project's ability to improve public health (up to 10 points)	5
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (up to 10 points)	7
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (up to 10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>52</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>59</b>

**Sacramento County**  
Arcade Creek Bicycle & Pedestrian Crossing Cycle 1

**\$1,079,000 Request**  
\$1,290,000 Total Cost

The project would design and construct a Class I multi-use crossing over Arcade Creek from Winding Way at Walnut Ave to American River College. The purpose of the project is to provide active transportation access directly to American River Community College, extending the reach of on-street bicycle facilities south of the project area.

<b>Project Scoring Criteria</b>		<b>Avg. Reviewer Score</b>
A	Project's ability to increase walking & biking (30 points)	16
B	Project's ability to reduce injuries & fatalities (25 points)	11
C	Project's ability to reduce GHG, support placemaking strategies (10 points)	6
D	Project's Cost Effectiveness (10 points)	7
E	Project's ability to improve public health (10 points)	5
F	Project benefitting a Disadvantaged Community (10 points)	7
G	Other (public outreach, past performance, project deliverability) (10 points)	7
<b>Total Score (of 95 points, omitting points from criteria F )</b>		<b>52</b>
<b>Total Score (of 105 points, all criteria categories included)</b>		<b>59</b>

## **Regional ATP Working Group Project Evaluation Process**

The ATP Working Group was tasked with developing a recommended \$9.8 million list of projects out of 45 projects requesting \$48 million. The process and Working Group make-up was defined in the ATP Policy Framework. The Working Group was comprised of one staff person each from SACOG, EDCTC, and PCTPA, as well as eight volunteers from around the region with a variety of applicable fields of expertise. The full Working Group composition is detailed in Attachment D. The evaluation process involved quantitative scoring on the criteria approved in the Regional ATP Guidelines (Attachment E), as well as qualitative discussion and analysis.

Working Group members were convened during August 11-15 for three four-hour meetings. The Working Group meetings were facilitated by non-voting SACOG staff. Working Group members whose agencies applied to the Regional ATP, were partners on an application, or had other stated conflicts of interest did not score their own projects and were asked to leave the room when their projects were discussed. The final recommended funding list and contingency list (Attachment A) were approved unanimously.

The following five lists were utilized both to evaluate projects and develop a final funding recommendation:

- *95-point List*—Initial Working Group rankings of all projects using all criterion except the 10 points for Disadvantaged Communities (maximum of 95 points possible);
- *105-point List*— Initial Working Group rankings of all projects, including the 10 points for Disadvantaged Communities (maximum of 105 points possible);
- *Consideration List*—a list of projects that scored above 60 points initially or were nominated for consideration by two Working Group members if the project’s initial score was below 60 points;
- *Not for Consideration List*—a list of projects that scored below 60 points during the initial scoring process, or were nominated for removal from consideration by a supermajority of Working Group members following thorough discussion and evaluation;
- *ATP Funding Recommendation List*—the final list of projects the Working Group recommended for funding, including contingency projects in the event of late project delivery.

The process for scoring projects and developing the recommended project list is described in detail below.

### **Step 1: Eligibility and Initial Scoring**

Staff from SACOG, EDCTC, and PCTPA screened all project applications utilizing the eight project criteria outlined in the Regional ATP Guidelines and determined that all applications were eligible to compete for funding. Each application was then reviewed by five to six evaluators prior to the first Working Group meeting and scored on the approved seven scoring criteria. SACOG and PCTPA staff reviewed and scored all 45 eligible applications; EDCTC scored all but their own project. The other eight Working Group members each initially reviewed and scored approximately 20 applications prior to meeting on Working Group Day 1.

### **Step 2: 95-Point and 105-Point Lists Reviewed**

At the first meeting, all of the scores (using both 95-point and 105-point lists) were compiled and reviewed by the Working Group (Figure C.1).

**Figure C.1: Initial Scores**

County	Applicant	Project Title	Avg. Increase walking /biking		Avg. GHG Reduction	Avg. Cost Effectiveness	Avg. Public Health		Avg. Other Considerations	Initial Score w/o DC score (95 points)	Initial Score +DC score (105 points)
			Avg. Safety				Avg. DC				
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Mather Rails to Trails Project	24	20	6	10	5	10	8	72	82
YOL	City of West Sacramento	West Capitol Ave Cycle Track	23	15	8	8	9	9	9	72	80
SAC	Sacramento County	El Camino Avenue Phase 2 - Street and Sidewalk Improvements	21	23	6	6	7	9	9	71	81
SAC	Sacramento County	Fair Oaks Boulevard Improvements Stanley Avenue to North Avenue (FOBI)	22	17	9	9	6	9	8	71	80
SAC	City of Galt	South Galt Safe Routes to Schools	23	18	6	7	9	8	9	71	79
YOL	City of Davis	Safe Routes to School Improvement Project	22	20	6	8	6	1	9	70	71
SUT	City of Yuba City	Franklin Road Improvements	21	15	6	10	8	10	9	69	79
ELD	El Dorado County	US Highway 50/Weber Creek Bridge Bicycle and Pedestrian Path	17	22	8	6	7	7	10	69	75
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Sycamore Phase 2	22	19	5	7	8	8	7	69	77
YUB	Yuba County	Ella Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project	20	18	7	8	9	10	7	68	78
SAC	City of Folsom	Oak Parkway Trail Undercrossing and Johnny Cash Trail Connection Project	21	19	8	8	6	3	7	68	71
SAC	Sacramento County	Arcade Creek Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing, Cycle 1	20	15	8	9	7	9	8	67	76
PLA	City of Roseville	Downtown Pedestrian Bridge	19	16	8	8	7	5	8	66	70
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Citywide Bike Lane Gap Closures	22	15	7	7	8	7	7	65	72
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Laguna Creek Trail and Bruceville Road SRTS Improvements	21	14	6	9	5	8	7	62	70
SUT	City of Live Oak	Recreational Trail Phase 2	19	15	6	7	6	10	7	61	71
SAC	City of Sacramento	Front Street Bike Lanes	18	14	6	8	7	1	8	60	61
PLA	Town of Loomis	Loomis Town Center Implementation Plan - Phase 2	19	17	6	6	5	1	6	58	59
PLA	City of Auburn	Nevada Street Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities	17	16	6	8	4	8	7	57	65
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Improvements	17	13	5	8	7	5	7	57	62
SAC	City of Sacramento	North Natomas Bike Path Reconstruction	16	13	6	8	6	1	7	56	57
YUB	Yuba County	Linda Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project	17	13	5	8	8	9	6	55	65
YOL	City of Woodland	Bicycle and Pedestrian Enhancement Project	16	16	5	4	6	6	7	55	61
SAC	Sacramento County	Rosemont HS Branch Ctr Rd Bicycle & Ped Improvements Project	18	12	5	8	4	0	7	54	55
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Laguna Creek Trail Under-crossings at Waterman & Bond Road	16	11	6	8	5	2	7	53	55
ELD	El Dorado County Transportation Commission	Western Slope Bicycle Travel Opportunities Map	18	11	5	5	6	6	7	53	59
SAC	City of Sacramento	El Camino Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	16	13	6	6	6	8	6	53	61
PLA	Placer County	Auburn Folsom Road Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Project	17	12	4	8	4	0	8	52	53
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Anatolia Bike Trail	17	13	4	6	4	0	7	52	53
SUT	City of Live Oak	Community Trail Phase 4	19	11	5	3	7	9	7	52	62
SAC	City of Sacramento	Public Bike Parking	20	5	5	8	7	1	8	52	53
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Rancho Cordova Safe and Active Routes to School Project	16	11	5	6	7	8	7	52	59
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Clarksburgh Branch Line Trail	15	12	4	6	7	4	7	51	55
PLA	City of Lincoln	Moore Road Bike Path Connectivity	17	12	5	5	4	0	7	51	51
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Cordova Park Safe Routes to School Project	18	11	5	6	5	7	6	51	58
SUT	City of Live Oak	Kola Street Safe Routes to School, Cycle 1	18	9	4	6	6	9	6	51	60
SAC	City of Sacramento	North Laguna Creek Bike Path Reconstruction	13	11	6	7	7	9	8	50	59
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Sycamore Phase 3	14	14	3	5	7	7	6	50	57
YOL	University of California	Russell Corridor Active Transportation Improvement Project	15	13	5	5	3	0	7	48	48
ELD	City of Placerville	Combella Road Safe Routes to Schools Project	20	11	2	5	3	7	7	47	55
PLA	City of Colfax	N. Main Street Bike Route Project	13	12	5	8	3	1	5	46	47
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Power Line Trail/Hudson Basin Trailhead Improvements	15	11	4	7	3	0	5	45	45
SUT	City of Live Oak	Pedestrian Improvement Plan	12	11	5	2	5	9	6	42	51
SAC	Sacramento Regional Transit District	Active Transportation Study	13	10	6	3	3	7	6	41	48
ELD	El Dorado County	ADA Plan	7	6	4	4	4	3	6	31	34



### Step 3: Consideration and Non-Consideration Lists

After review of the 95- and 105-point lists, a 60-point threshold was chosen as a natural breakpoint in project scores, and generated a diverse list of nearly \$24 million worth of funding requests (over half of the amount requested through submitted applications) for further Working Group discussion. Projects that scored over 60 points were moved to a *Consideration List*. Projects that scored below 60 points on the 95-point scale were moved to a *Not for Consideration List*.

Between the Day 1 and Day 2 meetings, all Working Group members were asked to review project applications on the *Consideration List*, as well as revisit any projects on the *Not for Consideration List* while re-reviewing applications. Any project on the *Not for Consideration List* could be nominated by two Working Group members for movement to the *Consideration List* at any point during the first two meetings.

Below are the 24 projects requesting a total \$26 million that scored below 60 points and were not nominated to move to the *Consideration List*.

Figure C.2: Day 1 *Not for Consideration List*

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Total Cost
PLA	Town of Loomis	Loomis Town Center Implementation Plan - Phase 2	\$965,000	\$1,120,000
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Improvements	\$1,076,000	\$1,216,000
SAC	City of Sacramento	North Natomas Bike Path Reconstruction	\$481,000	\$540,000
YUB	Yuba County	Linda Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project	\$865,000	\$964,600
YOL	City of Woodland	Bicycle and Pedestrian Enhancement Project	\$2,096,560	\$2,368,192
SAC	Sacramento County	Rosemont HS Branch Ctr Rd Bicycle & Ped Improvements	\$1,800,000	\$2,006,600
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Laguna Creek Trail Under-crossings at Waterman & Bond Rd.	\$1,839,000	\$2,077,000
SAC	City of Sacramento	El Camino Avenue Sidewalk Improvements	\$689,516	\$1,126,420
PLA	Placer County	Auburn Folsom Road Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Project	\$739,000	\$1,080,278
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Anatolia Bike Trail	\$1,000,000	\$1,347,000
SUT	City of Live Oak	Community Trail Phase 4	\$425,000	\$480,000
SAC	City of Sacramento	Public Bike Parking	\$251,000	\$284,000
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Rancho Cordova Safe and Active Routes to School Project	\$490,650	\$490,650

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Total Cost
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Clarksburg Branch Line Trail	\$1,723,679	\$1,947,000
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Cordova Park Safe Routes to School Project	\$3,043,000	\$3,625,000
SUT	City of Live Oak	Kola Street Safe Routes to School, Cycle 1	\$632,990	\$715,000
SAC	City of Sacramento	North Laguna Creek Bike Path Reconstruction	\$568,000	\$638,000
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Sycamore Phase 3	\$615,284	\$695,000
YOL	University of California	Russell Corridor Active Transportation Improvement Project	\$3,878,000	\$4,616,700
ELD	City of Placerville	Combella Road Safe Routes to Schools Project	\$242,149	\$280,000
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Power Line Trail/Hudson Basin Trailhead Improvements	\$1,791,000	\$2,023,000
SUT	City of Live Oak	Pedestrian Improvement Plan	\$126,000	\$140,453
SAC	Sacramento Regional Transit District	Active Transportation Study	\$177,000	\$200,000
ELD	El Dorado County	ADA Plan	\$230,000	\$260,000

#### Step 4: Discussion of Consideration List

Working Group Day 1 and Day 2 consisted of thoroughly evaluating each project that scored higher than 60 points, or that was moved from the *Not for Consideration List* to the *Consideration List*, based on the project's merits as outlined in the approved Regional ATP Guidelines:

- Increase walking and bicycling through targeted strategies: increasing access to transit services, increasing access to schools, eliminating gaps or removing barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network, and completing facilities (0-30 points)
- Reduce the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries (0-25 points)
- Improve public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues (0-10 points)
- Demonstrates cost effectiveness, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and operating expenditures while offering strong performance benefits (0-10 points)
- Provides benefit to a disadvantaged community and includes project features that provide benefit for members of this community (0-10 points)

- Project advances active transportation efforts to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through reducing or shortening vehicle trips today and over time, as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391 (0-10 points)
- Other considerations: project demonstrates readiness to deliver within the ATP schedule, performance on past grants and/or Federal Aid Projects, and strong support by stakeholders in the community in which the project is located (0-10 points)

At the end of Day 2, and prior to final scoring, four projects requesting approximately \$4 million were moved from the *Consideration List* to the *Not for Consideration* list. These projects were initially scored and discussed by the Working Group during the first two days and were determined to be less competitive than the rest of the projects on the *Consideration* list. Following a supermajority vote, the following projects (Figure C.3) were moved to the *Not for Consideration* list.

Figure C.3: Day 2 removals from *Consideration List*

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Total Cost
ELD	El Dorado County	US Highway 50/Weber Creek Bridge Bicycle and Pedestrian Path	\$1,058,159	\$1,452,205
PLA	City of Roseville	Downtown Pedestrian Bridge	\$2,487,000	\$2,809,000
PLA	City of Lincoln	Moore Road Bike Path Connectivity	\$373,000	\$457,877
SAC	City of Sacramento	Front Street Bike Lanes	\$256,000	\$289,000

The final *Consideration List* was then comprised of 17 projects requesting \$18 million (Figure C.4). These projects were re-scored by Working Group members after Day 2, and discussed and evaluated on Day 3.

Figure C.4: Day 3 *Consideration List*

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Total Cost
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Mather Rails to Trails Project	\$2,234,516	\$2,524,021
YOL	City of West Sacramento	West Capitol Ave Cycle Track	\$557,739	\$630,000
SAC	Sacramento County	El Camino Avenue Phase 2 - Street and Sidewalk Improvements	\$1,691,800	\$1,922,800
SAC	Sacramento County	Fair Oaks Boulevard Improvements Stanley Avenue to North Avenue (FOBI)	\$2,100,000	\$2,373,000
SAC	City of Galt	South Galt Safe Routes to Schools	\$1,800,000	\$2,150,000

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Total Cost
YOL	City of Davis	Safe Routes to School Improvement Project	\$741,728	\$876,588
SUT	City of Yuba City	Franklin Road Improvements	\$312,500	\$393,000
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Sycamore Phase 2	\$838,407	\$947,031
YUB	Yuba County	Ella Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project	\$1,195,000	\$1,350,000
SAC	City of Folsom	Oak Parkway Trail Undercrossing and Johnny Cash T rail Connection Project	\$996,000	\$1,121,000
SAC	Sacramento County	Arcade Creek Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing, Cycle 1	\$1,079,000	\$1,290,000
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Citywide Bike Lane Gap Closures	\$524,629	\$592,600
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Laguna Creek Trail and Bruceville Road SRTS Improvements	\$2,021,000	\$2,283,000
SUT	City of Live Oak	Recreational Trail Phase 2	\$791,458	\$894,000
ELD	El Dorado County Transportation Commission	Western Slope Bicycle Travel Opportunities Map	\$50,000	\$56,478
PLA	City of Auburn	Nevada Street Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities	\$799,000	\$1,648,000
PLA	City of Colfax	North Main Street Bike Route Project	\$264,301	\$298,544

### Step 5: Final Scoring and Development of Recommendation List

All projects in the above *Consideration List* (Figure C.4) were re-scored and re-ranked by the Working Group and the results were presented using both a *95-point* list and a *105-point* list. Both lists ranked the same top seven projects requesting a total of \$8.8 million (Figure C.5). These top-scoring projects on both lists included five projects that scored a minimum eight out of ten points in the Disadvantaged Community criterion, which resulted in approximately \$6 million out of the \$9.8 million benefitting disadvantaged communities.

Figure C.5: Day 3’s top-ranking projects on *Consideration List* in ranking order, moved to *Fund list*

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding	
			Recommendation	Total Cost
SUT	City of Yuba City	Franklin Road Improvements	\$312,500	\$393,000
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Citywide Bike Lane Gap Closures	\$524,629	\$592,600
SAC	City of Rancho Cordova	Mather Rails to Trails Project	\$2,234,516	\$2,524,021
SAC	City of Galt	South Galt Safe Routes to Schools	\$1,800,000	\$2,150,000
SAC	Sacramento County	El Camino Avenue Phase 2 - Street and Sidewalk Improvements	\$1,691,800	\$1,922,800
SAC	City of Folsom	Oak Parkway Trail Undercrossing and Johnny Cash Trail Connection Project	\$996,000	\$1,121,000
YUB	Yuba County	Ella Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project	\$1,195,000	\$1,350,000

The ten remaining projects on the *Consideration List* (Figure C.6) were discussed and evaluated for funding with the remaining \$1.1 million. To whittle down the list, the Working Group evaluated each project’s merits based on the scoring criteria and in comparison to competing projects. The group eliminated projects one at a time using a supermajority vote.

Figure C.6: Projects that were still on *Consideration List* (total request: \$9.2 million, total available: \$1.1 million)

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Total Cost
PLA	El Dorado County Transportation Commission	Western Slope Bicycle Travel Opportunities Map	\$50,000	\$56,478
YOL	City of Davis	Safe Routes to School Improvement Project	\$741,728	\$876,588
PLA	City of Auburn	Nevada Street Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities	\$799,000	\$1,648,000
YOL	City of West Sacramento	West Capitol Ave Cycle Track	\$557,739	\$630,000
SUT	City of Live Oak	Recreational Trail Phase 2	\$791,458	\$894,000
YOL	City of West Sacramento	Sycamore Phase 2	\$838,407	\$947,031
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Laguna Creek Trail and Bruceville Road SRTS Improvements	\$2,021,000	\$2,283,000
PLA	City of Colfax	North Main Street Bike Route Project	\$264,301	\$298,544
SAC	Sacramento County	Fair Oaks Boulevard Improvements Stanley Avenue to North Avenue (FOBI)	\$2,100,000	\$2,373,000
SAC	Sacramento County	Arcade Creek Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing, Cycle 1	\$1,079,000	\$1,290,000

After much discussion, the Working Group recommended three additional projects totaling \$1.1 million (Figure C.7) to complete the \$9.8 million *ATP Funding Recommendation* list.

Figure C.7: Final additions to the *ATP Funding Recommendation* list

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Recommendation	Total Cost
ELD	El Dorado County Transportation Commission	Western Slope Bicycle Travel Opportunities Map	\$50,000	\$56,478
PLA	City of Auburn	Nevada Street Pedestrian & Bicycle Facilities	\$799,000	\$1,648,000
PLA	City of Colfax	N. Main Street Bike Route Project	\$264,300	\$298,544

The next highest-ranking projects were recommended for ATP funding contingency in the event any project in the above recommended list is unable to meet the required delivery schedule. (Figure C.8). The below projects will remain available to program for Cycle 1 Regional ATP funding until the CTC adoption of Regional ATP Cycle 2. Inclusion on the contingent list does not guarantee funding in ATP Cycle 1 or in future funding rounds. Project sponsors are encouraged apply to ATP Cycle 2 and other funding sources to fund these projects.

Figure C.8: ATP Funding Contingency list

County	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Total Cost
YOL	City of West Sacramento	West Capitol Avenue Cycle Track	\$524,600	\$592,600
SUT	City of Live Oak	Recreational Trail Phase 2	\$791,500	\$894,000
YOL	City of Davis	Safe Routes to School Improvement Project	\$741,700	\$876,588

The final ATP Funding Recommendation and Contingency lists were unanimously approved by the Working Group. SACOG staff have reviewed these projects and determined that the projects appear to be eligible and capable of meeting programming deadlines. Following Board approval, the project list will be submitted to the CTC for adoption.

Projects awarded ATP funding must be ready to allocate funds through the CTC within FY 2014-15 or FY 2015-16, and complete construction within the next three fiscal years. These projects will be closely monitored to ensure timely delivery within the identified constraints of the program; in the event that a project is unable to allocate the awarded funds within the timeframe identified by the CTC or obtain an extension, a project on the contingency list would allocate ATP funds in its place. In this instance, the project that failed to meet its delivery timeline would forfeit their ATP funds and would have to compete again to receive funds from the ATP or any other funding source.

# Regional ATP Working Group Roster

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Expertise</b>
Jerry Barton*	El Dorado County Transportation Commission	Land Use Planning
Ben Deal	Yuba Area Bicycle Advocates	Bike/Ped Advocacy
Victoria Cacciatore*	Sacramento Area Council of Governments	Transit
Victoria Custodio	SRTS Technical Assistance Resource Center	Bike/Ped Advocacy
Chris Dougherty	City of West Sacramento	Bike/Ped Planning
Aaron Hoyt*	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency	Bike/Ped Planning
Sondra Spaethe	Feather River Air Quality Management District	Air Quality
Kori Titus	Breathe CA	Community Groups
Sarah Underwood	Health Education Council	Public Health
Ron Vicari	Sacramento County DOT	Project Engineer
Jeff Werner	City of Elk Grove	Project Engineer

*\*member of Regional ATP Team*



## FINAL 2014 6-COUNTY REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM GUIDELINES

The purpose of this funding program is to implement strategies that increase and attract active transportation users and provide facilities for walking and biking in urban, suburban and rural portions of the region and to provide connections between them. Projects and programs funded through this program are consistent with the vision of the Blueprint and support the implementation of the long-range transportation plans for the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC), the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG).

In order to help implement active transportation projects in the six-county region, EDCTC, PCTPA, and SACOG invest regional funds regularly for infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects. ATP funds from the State of California provide an important new funding source for active transportation projects.

### PROGRAM GOALS

California Senate Bill (SB) 99 establishes California's ATP program with six program goals that provide a foundation for the state and regional ATP programs:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking;
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users;
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 (C728, §2008) and SB 391 (C585, §2009);
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity, through the use of programs including but not limited to projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding;
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program; and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

### ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

The infrastructure projects eligible for this funding program are largely derived from the SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan (Master Plan) that is amended every two years, with the last update in June 2013. The Master Plan provides an expansive set of policies and projects for regional bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts across the six-county SACOG region, and was developed through a working group and approved by the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and SACOG Board of Directors. Additionally, bicycle and pedestrian projects included in the Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) for EDCTC or PCTPA are also eligible. Projects must support the performance outcomes identified in the sections below.

Non-infrastructure projects eligible for funding meet at least one of two criteria: (1) Encourage biking and walking through public information, education, training, and awareness (2) Perform studies and develop plans that support one or more of the project performance outcomes identified in the section below.

The ATP is a State of California identified program implemented by the California Transportation Commission. As such the main source of revenue is a compilation of state and federal funding. The majority of projects will need to meet the requirements from the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). Projects must meet eligibility requirements specific to the ATP funding source provided.

### INELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

Projects in new developments that are considered "good practices" according to FHWA guidelines, bicycle and pedestrian facility maintenance, long-term staff positions, transit operations, law enforcement, and bicycle racks for carpools, vanpools, or private vehicles.

### PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

A Regional ATP Team comprised of representatives from the three involved regional transportation planning Agencies (RTPAs) in the region (EDCTC, PCTPA, SACOG)

will screen applications for eligibility. Applications will be removed from the competitive process if found ineligible based on the guidelines below. Projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition, but deemed eligible for the state program will be considered; applicants will be encouraged to submit a supplemental application.

Next, the Regional ATP Team forwards the eligible applications to the ATP Working Group (see below for the composition of this Group). The Working Group then prioritizes and ranks the applications, according to its own process, but does not discard any applications. Working Group members will not vote or comment on applications from their own organizations. The Working Group and/or Regional ATP Team staff reserves the right to contact applicants during this project selection process for additional information. The Working Group makes its recommendations to the Regional ATP Team. The Work Group will be multidisciplinary in nature and members should represent diverse geography. One Regional ATP Team representative from EDCTC, PCTPA and SACOG will participate on the Working Group.

**Working Group Membership**

Expertise	Recruited from	Number
Land Use Planners	Planners' Committee	1
Project Engineers	Regional Planning Partnership	2
Bicycle/ Pedestrian Planning	Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee	4 (2 advocates, 2 planners/ engineers)
Air Quality	Air Districts	1
Public Health	Public Health Representative	1
Transit	Transit Coordinating Committee	1
Community Groups	Regional Community Based Organizations	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>

The application process will be specific to the ATP. The Regional ATP Team in conjunction with the ATP Working Group will go through the ranking process to insure that 25% of available funds are dedicated to projects and programs benefiting Disadvantaged Communities as identified in the State Guidelines. Following this step, the projects will ranked on a 95 point scale without the 10 points for the Disadvantaged Communities criteria. Projects will be ranked and selected for the remaining 75% of funding utilizing both lists for reference. Discretion will be placed on the Working Group and Regional ATP team to select a comprehensive package of projects.

**PROJECT SCREENING**

To be selected for funding, a project or program must meet the following screening criteria:

- 1. Infrastructure Project is a planned project included in the SACOG Master Plan or the Regional Transportation Plan for EDCTC or PCTPA.** Only under special circumstances will an application be considered that is not listed in one of these sources.
- 2. Non-Infrastructure Project meets at least one of two eligibility requirements identified in the preceding section.**
- 3. Project must be ready for inclusion into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost.** The project application may include the cost of preparing environmental documents. When project design, right-of-way or construction are programmed before the implementing agency completes the environmental process, updated cost estimates, updated analysis of the projects cost effectiveness, and updated analysis of the project's ability to further the goals of the program must be submitted to appropriate RTPA (EDCTC, PCTPA, or SACOG) following completion of the environmental process for re-evaluation.
- 4. Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources** (i.e. TAP, HSIP, State Highway Account funds, Recreation Trails).

**5. Project meets the minimum dollar amount for an infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects and includes at least an 11.47% local match; application is to all project categories.**

- a. Infrastructure project minimum is \$278,675 (\$250,000 funding request + \$28,675 local match). The recommended infrastructure maximum project request is \$3 million, but there is no maximum total project cost.
- b. Non-Infrastructure project minimum is \$55,735 (\$50,000 funding request + \$5,735 local match).
- c. Public agencies applying for funding for smaller projects may want to consider combining projects to meet the project minimum thresholds, or consider a larger, multi-year program or project.

**6. Public Participation & Planning.** Project applicant must clearly demonstrate how a community-based public participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project. Inclusion of relevant notices and materials.

**7. Partnering with Community Conservation Corps.** Project proponent must demonstrate that the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, was sought out to participate as a partner to undertake the project; or provide demonstration of the cost effectiveness clause 23 CFR 635.204 and provide the relevant documentation.

**8. Projects are not part of developer-funded basic good practices.**

In addition to how projects address the program goals discussed above, below are scoring criteria considerations that will be used by the Working Group and the Regional ATP Team to make funding recommendations to the SACOG Board.

## **PROJECT SCORING**

Projects will be scored based on the criteria described in the state ATP guidelines with minor modifications as described below.

### **Project Performance Outcomes (0-95 points)**

- 1. Project has potential to increase walking and bicycling through targeted strategies: increasing access to transit services, increasing access to schools, eliminating gaps or removing barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network, and completing facilities. **0-30 points**
- 2. Project has the potential to reduce the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries. **0-25 points**
- 3. Project improves public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues. **0-10 points**
- 4. Project demonstrates cost effectiveness, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and operating expenditures while offering strong performance benefits. **0-10 points**
- 5. Project provides benefit to a disadvantaged community and includes project features that provide benefit for members of this community. **0-10 points** (Please reference the project selection process section.)
- 6. Project advances active transportation efforts to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through reducing or shortening vehicle trips today and over time, as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391. **0-10 points**

### **Other Considerations (0-10 points)**

- 7. Performance on Past Grants and/or Federal Aid Projects. Applications from agencies with good performance on delivering prior projects or programs are most likely to succeed with an ATP project award.
- 8. Project sponsor demonstrates readiness to move forward on a timely schedule with the proposed project (i.e. application provides

clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project).

9. Project applicant demonstrates evidence of strong support by stakeholders in the community in which the project is located.

**State ATP Awards within the Six-County SACOG Region**

<b>County</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>ATP Funding Awarded</b>	<b>Total Project Cost</b>
PLA	City of Roseville	Downtown Roseville Class 1 Trail	\$1,236,000	\$2,547,000
SAC	City of Elk Grove	Lower Laguna Creek Open Space Preserve Trail	\$1,573,000	\$1,778,000
SAC	Sacramento County	Howe Ave Bike & Pedestrian Improvement Project	\$1,853,000	\$2,067,000
SAC	San Juan Unified School District	Safe Routes to School	\$250,000	\$278,675
YOL	City of Davis	Safe Routes to School Program	\$562,000	\$626,461
YOL	City of Woodland	2014 SRTS	\$539,000	\$539,000
YUB	City of Marysville	Safe Routes to School Project & Programs	\$489,000	\$489,000
<b>Total Funding Awarded</b>			<b>\$6,502,000</b>	